



MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Violet Varona-Lukens, Executive Officer
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
Los Angeles, California 90012

Director of Planning
Regional Planning Commission

At its meeting held June 7, 2005, the Board took the following action:

4

Supervisor Knabe made the following statement:

“Project No. 90-184-(4) in Rowland Heights is a proposal to develop 55 homes, improve a hiking trail and dedicate privately owned open space to a public agency. To accommodate the construction of the homes, the project includes a proposed amendment to the Rowland Heights Community General Plan to change a portion of the 170-acre site, which is currently designated as Open Space, to Urban 1. The proposal also includes the related removal of the dedication of construction rights to the County which was a condition of a prior land division approval. Project No. 90-184-(4) also includes Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 49411-(4), Conditional Use Permit Case No. 90-184-(4) and Oak Tree Permit Case No. 90-184-(4). The Regional Planning Commission denied the project on September 1, 2004, after hearing extensive public testimony over the course of several public hearing dates. The Commission's denial of the project was based in part on the fact that the 170-acre site had been previously restricted and set aside as open space and the lack of sufficient information to find that sufficient public benefits outweighed the loss of the open space. The denial has been appealed to the Board.

(Continued on Page 2)

4 (Continued)

“While at the Commission, the applicant suggested an alternative proposal of 43 homes on approximately 30 acres, which also included the legalization of an existing horse stable facility on a portion of the overall 170-acre site. Consideration of this alternative would require initiation by the Board or the Commission of an amendment to Rowland Heights Community General Plan to allow the operation of the stables at its current location. The suggested alternative also included the funding of staff to maintain and manage the remaining open space. There may be other potential community benefits which could be offered by the applicant. The applicant should be provided an opportunity to present a package of community benefits so that the Planning Commission can determine whether a plan amendment is warranted for an alternative project. The public should be provided with an opportunity to provide full input.

“With the current demand for housing and the dwindling supply of developable land, this Board is likely to be faced with the future prospect of redesignating open space in our Community and General Plans to accommodate needed housing development. Proposals to redesignate open space may be appropriate if the corresponding public benefits outweigh the loss of the open space. Such benefits may include the provision of alternative open space, conversion of privately held to publicly held open space, funding for the management of publicly held open space, funding for equestrian and hiking trail improvements, improvements to community facilities, funding of recreation programs or other appropriate community benefits identified by the local community working with an applicant.

“As the advisory agency to this Board, the Planning Commission working with planning staff is well equipped to reconsider this project and any alternatives and review the technical details before returning the case to this Board with a recommendation.”

Ellen Fitzgerald, representing the Department of Regional Planning, Gordon Youde and Dave Shibley addressed the Board.

(Continued on Page 3)

4 (Continued)

After discussion, Supervisor Knabe made a motion that the Board refer Local Plan Amendment Case No. 90-184-(4), Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 49411-(4), Conditional Use Permit Case No. 90-184-(4) and Oak Tree Permit Case No. 90-184-(4) back to the Regional Planning Commission for further proceedings with the following instructions:

- a. Take the steps necessary to initiate an amendment to the Rowland Heights Community General Plan to allow the Commission to consider alternative land use proposals for the project site which include the horse stables and to consider whether proposed community benefits associated with an alternative project outweigh the loss of the open space.
- b. Obtain community input by holding at least one noticed public meeting in the local community.
- c. Consider potential community benefits including but not limited to the provision of alternative open space, conversion of privately held to publicly held open space, funding for the management of publicly held open space, funding for equestrian and hiking trail improvements, improvements to community facilities, funding of recreation programs or other appropriate community benefits identified by the local community working with an applicant.

After further discussion, Supervisor Knabe made a motion, seconded by Supervisor Burke, to approve the aforementioned motion as amended to remove the instruction to the Regional Planning Commission other than to conduct a public hearing to consider community benefits; and that the Board indicate that they have taken no position on the merits of the application until it is returned to the Board for consideration following the Regional Planning Commission's reconsideration. Said motion failed to carry by the following vote: Ayes: Supervisors Burke and Knabe; Noes: Supervisors Yaroslavsky, Antonovich and Molina.

Therefore, by common consent and there being no objection, the Chair instructed the Executive Officer of the Board to schedule a public hearing before this Board on Local Plan Amendment, Conditional Use Permit and Oak Tree Permit Case Nos. 90-184-(4), and Vesting Tentative Tract Map Case No. 49411-(4).

04060705_4

Copies distributed:

Each Supervisor
County Counsel
W. R. Lind
Gordon Youde
Dave Shibley